

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-44 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-44 were rejected in the Office Action dated February 26, 2004. No claims are amended in this Amendment. Accordingly, claims 1-44 are at issue in the above-identified application.

#### **I. Objection To Specification**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Abstract because of undue length, repetition of title and recitation of purported merits. In response, Applicants have amended the Abstract in accordance with the Examiner's statements.

#### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Young et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,280,575). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to claim 1, for example, at least because *Young et al.* does not teach or suggest "storing on a first record property data of said spreadsheet file," "storing on a second record access data of said spreadsheet file," nor "storing on a third record spreadsheet cell data for a plurality of spreadsheet cells." As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action dated February 26, 2004, *Young et al.* does not teach any of the limitations in the body of the claim. For example, the Examiner states in the Office Action, "*Young et al.* does not explicitly teach storing on a first record property data of said spreadsheet file; storing on a second record access data of said spreadsheet file; storing on a third record spreadsheet cell data for a plurality of spreadsheet cells." (Office Action, p. 3). Applicants acknowledge that these limitations are not taught by the cited reference *Young et al.* and submit that they are not rendered obvious in view of the cited reference.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claim 1 at least because the cited reference *Young et al.* teaches away from the purported motivation asserted by the Examiner. For example, the Examiner states “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of the time of invention to be motivated to store the property, access, and cell data each in its own record or space because the invention of *Young et al.* would process the actions of its users faster if the similar information were all grouped in the same area than if the similar information were stored in various locations especially when the users are implementing the invention of *Young et al.* on systems with limited processing speed.” For example, claim 1 recites storing access data (*e.g.*, number of columns and cell IDs, for example), on a second record and storing spreadsheet cell data for a plurality of spreadsheet cells on a third record. In contrast, in *Young et al.* column data, for example, is stored in the same area as the actual table data. (See col. 5, 1. 60 - col. 6, 1. 11). For example, *Young et al.* states “the table contents portion 13 may include one or more tables each defined by a table definition 59...which stores information concerning the table and...stores the actual table data.” (Col. 5, 1. 61 - 1. 67). Further, column data in *Young et al.* is stored with a cell. For example, *Young et al.* states “[t]he cell header includes a cell column number field 100 which identifies the column of the cell...” (Col. 8, 11. 20-22). As a result, claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference *Young et al.* Claims 2-11 which depend from claim 1 are also patentable over *Young et al.* for at least the same reasons.


For reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that the rejection of independent claims 12, 23, and 34 should be withdrawn. With respect to claims 13-22, 24-33, and 35-44, these claims depend from claims 12, 23, and 34, respectively, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 25, 2004

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kimani P. Clark  
Registration No. 45,969

Customer Number: 26263  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
Phone: (202) 408-9214  
Fax: (312) 876-7457